DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 092 SP 026 776

AUTHOR Shah, J. H.
TITLE An Evaluation Tool for a Teacher-Educator.
PUB DATE Jul 85
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the World Assembly of the International Council on Education for Teaching (32nd, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, July 22-26, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Education Majors; *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Educators; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

A report is given on an evaluation instrument designed for use by education majors in evaluating teacher educators. The instrument consists of five sub-parts: (1) rating scales for individual instructors; (2) 24 behavioral statements, evenly balanced between positive and negative; (3) statements on "good-bad qualities" of teachers as well as other staff members; (4) a five-point scale for assessing the effectiveness of dissertation guidance; and (5) selection of the two best and two worst teachers on the faculty. Copies of the instrument are appended. A brief discussion is presented on an analysis of the results of an evaluation of the Education faculty at Gujarat University, India. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263092

AN EVALUATION TOOL FOR A TEACHER - EDUCATOR

Dr. J.H. Shah
Reader and Head
Department of Education
Gujarat University
Ahmedabad 380 009.
INDIA.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Leavitt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"Evaluation" may be defined as the gathering of evidence regarding the quality of teaching or educational practices in the light of the objectives, criteria, and standards as the basis for decision making. The evaluation tool developed here for teachers teaching M. Ed., class was meant to be used for improving the functioning of the department as a whole-the quality of teaching, dissertation guidance and inter-relationship between the teacher and the taught. It consists of five sub-parts : (1) Rating Scales (2) Guess who (3) Good-Bad qualities (4) Relationship with a teacher guiding dissertation and (5) Two best and two poorest teachers, and finally, general observations.

During the academic year 1983-84, the tool was tentatively developed and used for ninteen teacher-educators teaching the M. Ed., class of the department of Education, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad. Out of these nineteen teachers, two were faculty members of the University department while the rest were visiting teachers from local colleges of Education who jointly shared the work of teaching different optional papers. These teacher educators were evaluated by 25 students of the M. Ed. class.

The data gathered was analysed sub-part wise. Reliability and validity of the tool were established. The study was meant to be a pilot study.

Refinement of the tool :

(a) The forwarding letter addressed to the testees-M.Ed. Students was found to be somewhat lengthy and there was some reduplication of some ideas. It was made concise as well as explicit.

(b) In part(a) "rating scales", no changes were to be made. The number of teacher-educators was now fourteen instead of nineteen as was in year 1983-84.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 026 776

This paper was presented and discussed at the thirty - second ICET World Assembly held in Vancouver, Canada on July 23, 1985.

(c) In part (b) "guess-who," twenty four behavioural statements were devised, with half of them positively baised, and the other-half negatively baised, thus maintaining a balance. Some new statements were added, while some statements having the same shade of meaning deleted.

(d) In part (c) "good-bad qualities," no major change was made. But the evaluation of non-teaching staff-clerical and menial-was added.

(e) In part (d) "dissertation guidance," the three-point Scale (Yes, ?, No) was converted into a five-point scale (always, frequently, sometimes, rarely and never) to get more detailed data for analysis. Some modifications were made in the statements on the basis of open-end based responses given by former students. In the last sub-part, some statements were given by way of illustration.

(f) In part (e), a new dimension of "two best teachers and two poorest" was incorporated, wherein the students were to write in names of teachers, as applicable. The sub part of "general observation" was retained.

The detailed description of this tool has been omitted here as a copy of the tool is appended herewith and it is self-explanatory. The present investigator has not yet come across such an evaluation tool for teacher-educators, developed and tried out in India. Hence this modest attempt to construct and standardise a tool based on the experience with Gujarati subjects. Of course, it can now be used elsewhere in India by translating it into other regional languages. In the United States "there is a growing trend toward the involvement of students in the upper grades in evaluating teachers. Evidence supports the belief that students can make valid and reliable assessment of teachers' performance." 1

SAMPLE

The study was conducted on twenty-six students of the M.Ed class studying at the Department of Education, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad during the academic year 1984-85. The subjects evaluated, as mentioned earlier, were two university-teachers and twelve visiting post-graduate teachers. It should be clarified here that students evaluated only the teachers with whom they were in direct contact. A student has to do two compulsory papers, and three other papers from among the electives. For dissertation guidance, the teacher could be from among these fourteen teachers, or from other thirteen teachers who had not shared teaching work.

ANALYSIS

The fourteen teachers were rated in a descending order. Only two teachers taught the whole class. Table 49 from Garrett[2] was used in combining incomplete order of merit ratings by changing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

them into units of scores, which were then averaged. Table I presents these data.

Table - I

THE MEAN SCORES ON RATTING SCALE

Teacher Educator	Mean Score	Order of Merit
A	63.59	10
B	52.70	6
C	56.45	7
D	15.32	1
E	62.43	8
F	67.29	12
G	38.27	3
H	67.38	13
I	66.66	11
J	25.16	2
K	50.16	5
L	76.25	14
M	63.26	9
N	41.83	4

In part (b) "Guess Who" twenty four behavioural patterns of a teacher-educator with students in a classroom were listed. Out of these, twelve were positive statements : 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 18, 20, 21, 23 and 24. Others were negative baised statements, which were given - 1 credit each. A positive statement was allotted + 1 credit. The total credits earned by teachers were derived by summing up these credits algebraically, and the figure was then divided by the number of student-respondents, giving thereby the mean credit score for each teacher. These data have been presented in Table II.

Table - II

MEAN CREDIT SCORES ON "GUESS WHO"

Teacher educator	Total credit Scores	Total Respon-dents	Mean Scores	Order of Merit
A	-02	11	-0.18	11
B	-25	22	-1.14	13
C	11	11	1.00	8
D	205	26	7.88	1
E	43	11	3.91	5
F	-13	11	-1.18	14
G	27	11	2.45	7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[over

(contd.)

1	2	3	4	5
H	-12	11	-1.09	12
I	9	2	4.50	3.5
J	10	2	5.00	2
K	- 5	2	2.50	6
L	5	11	0.45	9
M	1	11	0.09	10
N	9	2	4.50	3.5

If the statement-wise total credits are taken into consideration, the picture is shown in Table III.

Table - III

STATEMENTS WISE TOTAL CREDITS

Serial number of + ve statements	Total Credits	Serial number of -ve statements	Total Credits
2	41	1	10
4	46	3	6
6	34	5	16
7	40	9	28
8	43	11	21
10	39	12	8
13	41	14	22
18	32	15	8
20	36	16	14
21	36	17	23
23	30	19	18
24	29	22	3

On analysis, it was found-with a sigh of relief for the department concerned - that the statement No.22 ('May God save us from such a Professor!') had the lowest, namely, minimum three frequencies, while the statement No.4 ('Has a good command over the subject') had the highest frequencies i.e. 46. Statements 2, 7, 8 and 13 also have higher frequencies. On the other hand, statements 9, 11, 14 and 17 are negative statements having more than twenty frequencies. This should provide an occasion for some introspection on the part of the teachers concerned, which may lead to improvement.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In part (c) "good and bad qualities", the analysis has been presented for an individual teacher instead of giving an over-all blanket-type list of good and bad qualities. It has been pre-resolved not to give more than three (good or bad) qualities for each teacher.

Good Bad Qualities of an Individual Teacher

A: (1) Methodical presentation; is eager to teach everything.
(2) Comes to the class-room without prior preparation; is strict on the score of attendance

B: (1) Honest; has mastery over the subject; takes class regularly
(2) Sometimes loses temper; has nothing new to offer in terms of his subject-matter

C: (1) Solves the difficulties of students; is very punctual; imparts new information
(2) Sometimes goes on writing on the blackboard and speaks little; no burst of laughter in the course of his lecture

D: (1) Takes even extra classes enthusiastically; makes sure that the students have grasped the point or a new concept fully; will prove to be an unforgettable character
(2) Short-tempered; hypersensitive; an over-emphasis on punctuality and discipline

E: (1) A very skilful teacher; becomes one with his subject
(2) Uses some words very often; sometimes speaks too fast

F: (1) Explains very nicely by giving proper illustrations; a good command on his subject
(2) Demands pin-drop silence in his class; no Bb work at all

G: (1) Excellent teaching; always makes points consistent with his topic; always comes well-prepared
(2) Sometimes boredom prevails in the class-room; rare chance to speak and to participate in the classroom

H: (1) Deals subtopicwise-methodically; his lecture is marked by an occasional burst of laughter; has a loving-nature
(2) Talks about non-academic things more often; very strict to on attendance

I: (1) Up-to-date in information; demands hard work from students
(2) Should correlate his subject/topic with others; never saw him in a jovial mood

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

J: (1) Well informed and upto-date in his subject
(2) Sometimes not punctual; speaks in a low voice

K. (1) Lovable; very punctual; always minds his own work
(2) Sometimes repeats the same thing; many a time dictates notes (as no book in Gujarati is available in his subject)

L: (1) An expert in his own subject; distributes necessary material pertaining to his topics
(2) Speaks too fast and very loudly; sometimes blows his own trumpet

M: (1) Has a great command on his subject, is methodical in teaching
(2) Uses his own regional dialect; speaks fast and then repeats the same point

N: (1) Takes pains to collect necessary material for students; is sincere in his dealings
(2) Less practical in dealings with students, sometimes dictates notes

As a subpart, the qualities of members of non-teaching staff are described below :

(1) The Clerk :

(a) Very particular in his own work; co-operative and industrious
(b) Always behaves as if he is the monarch of all he surveys; very rude behaviour with the students; very irregular

(2) The Peon :

(a) Sober, very co-operative, polite, never tires of work; efficient and shoulders some of the responsibilities of a clerk. [It is very heartening to note that not a single student has written a single word against him. Of course, the other peons (coming in shifts) are not so well-behaved as is noted by the respondents.]

Finally, the Head of the department is evaluated as an administrator by the respondents as follows :

1. Always thinks and works for the good of the students; is very efficient as an administrator; wants to do everything so that his department prospers
2. Loses temper easily as an administrator; sometimes hypersensitiveness mars his efficiency as an administrator

In subpart (d) "dissertation guidance work", the relationship with the guide was rated as under :

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

38.46% excellent, 26.92% good, 15.38% very fair, 3.84% fair, nil in 'poor' category and four out of total 26 respondents, that is, 15.40% did not respond at all. It may be noted that the relationship between the guide and the student, as a whole, is found to be healthy and congenial.

For a complete picture, the responses on the statement have been presented in Table IV.

TABLE - IV

RESPONSES RREGARDING DISSEERATATION GUIDANCE

Statement number	Type (+ or -)	Always	Fre quently	some- times	rarely	never	weighted score
1	+	16	3	3	-	-	4.59
2	-	-	2	11	7	2	3.41
3	-	1	-	3	3	12	4.32
4	+	17	3	3	2	-	4.40
5	-	-	1	1	2	16	4.65
6	-	-	1	1	3	11	4.50
7	-	2	1	2	3	12	4.10
8	+	15	5	3	-	-	4.52
9	-	2	-	6	1	12	4.00
10	-	1	-	3	4	13	4.33
11	+	9	4	2	5	2	3.59
12	-	1	1	3	4	9	4.05
13	-	5	3	2	3	8	3.29
14	+	16	3	1	4	-	4.29
15	-	7	2	5	1	8	3.04

The total mean weighted score is 4.07 which clearly indicates that, as a whole, the guidance work is carried out very satisfactorily as per the experiences of the respondents. Attention may, however, be drawn to the fact that there are about 30.43 per cent of respondents who consider the whole dissertation work "useless" as per the statement number 15. In the last section, students were asked to respond in an open-end manner by giving their opinions and suggestions for betterment as well as smooth functioning of this work.

Here are some of mentioned responses :

(Out of twenty-six respondents, nine (34.62%) have not responded at all.)

(a) All guides are not up-to-the-mark for guidance work

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(b) It would be better if some arrangement can be made to meet the respective guides in the department itself; it will save a lot of energy, money and time on both the sides. Again, it will lead to greater punctuality.

(c) An introduction of a log-book will not serve the purposes; it will rather tell upon the time of the teacher and the taught, and in the end will turn into a farce.

(d) Many respondents have appreciated the idea of introducing a log-book, and have suggested surprise checks twice to thrice in a term.

(e) Students should not depend too heavily on the guides; they should also show initiative and try to solve their own problems.

(f) The guides should be some-what strict in exacting work from their students.

(g) The head of the department should check the guidance work provided by the visiting techers, and for this a log book is need of the day.

(h) The teachers should not feel any inhibition in discussing with the head of the department and other experts, details regarding the necessary guidelines.

The last subpart (e) consists of two sub-sections. The first one is an over-all evaluation of the professors; name two best and two poorest teachers. There are a few teachers whose names figure in both the categories.

They are : B,C,E,F,J and M (six in number). The teachers D,G and K are in the first section only, while teachers H and L are in the other section only. The names of the teachers who are to guide dissertations only are also mentioned, which throws light on their functioning.

In the second sub - section (general observations) seventeen out of 26 students had to say or add nothing. Some students have mentioned their own personel difficulties, such as, (a)there is no book in Gujarati on "Philosophical and Sociological Foundations on Education" in the departmental library (b) the clerk has behaved with us in the worst possible manner, (c) a certain teacher should be given a particular subject only, (d) there should not be much insistence on attendance. They also have appreciated certain positive asects of the department, such as, (a)personel care is being taken here (b)the facilities of library are quite satisfactory, (c) there is a team-spirit among all the teachers, (d)we are here well treated (except by the clerk), (e)we will never forget these memorable days spent so fruitfully at the department.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONCLUSION:

It can be seen from the analysis and the tables presented that the M.Ed. students had responded very well and had called a spade a spade, thus helping the investigator in the right manner.

It is evident from the content of the paper what steps should now be taken for the improvement of the working of the department. The investigator would like to end his paper with data about reliability and validity of the tool.

The data were collected in March 1985, and since then all educational institutions - from the pre-primary to the Universities - have been closed. Hence test-retest reliability could not be computed. However, the test-retest reliability of the original crude tool was found to be 0.74 at about one month's interval by Spearman's rank-difference method, using ranking (order of merit) of the sub-part (a) rating scale. The rich and wide content of this tool is sufficient to establish its content validity. The order of merit (Table I) is correlated with the mean score (Table II), "Guess Who". The coefficient of correlation (ρ) was 0.68.

This tool can now be used in other faculties of the University by making necessary modifications. The Higher Secondary School authorities can also develop their own tool on the basis of this refined tool.

REFERENCES

1. Richard Wynn and et.al. American Education (8th Edition) New York : Mc Graw Hill Book Company, 1977, p. 56.

2. Henry E. Garrett : Statistics in Psychology and Education (5th Indian Edition) Bombay, Vakils, Fefferand Simons Private Ltd., 1969, p. 328-332.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX

AN EVALUATION TOOL FOR A TEACHER EDUCATOR

Dr.J.H.Shah
Reader and Head
Department of Educatin
Gujarat University,
Ahmedabad 380 009 (INDIA)

GENERAL INFORMATION

Academic Year : Code No.

Date : Place :

Dear Students,

Your academic year for the M. Ed. class is about to end so far as your class-room lectures and dissertation guidance are concerned. During the year, you have come in contact with a number of professors in one way or the other and you have had varied experiences. You always have something to say about all these experiences, but you hesitate for what you may have to say (or present before the authority) may be some bitter, unpalatable truth and you fear that, it may go against you-it may jeopardize your future. But my friends, as Head of the Department I assure you that the information furnished by you will, without doubt, remain confidential. You have neither to write your name nor to disclose your identity in any way.

The only objective of this evaluation is to bring about an improvement in the M.Ed. programme: lectures, dissertation guidance, administration, etc. In the United States such a practice, as I have come to know, is very common, a part of the routine work, and every college (or university) teacher is evaluated by the students and then, the committee concerned, takes necessary measures.

For this, your personel beliefs or responses should be very specific and honest so that the planning of the department can be student-oriented.

The following measures have been taken so that your honest and critical responses remain confidential and the best use of the information provided through this tool can be made.

(a) You have not to write your name or roll-number anywhere.

(b) Collective-analysis will be done of all the responses furnished by you and it will be taken into consideration in toto and not in regard to individual cases.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(c) The only objective of this tool is to make the whole teaching-learning process and guidance work, thoroughly academic and it is, therefore, expected from you that you respond very honestly.

(d) It will be seen that your indentification is not divulged; yet, objective-illustrations of your experiences can be put down to achieve the objectives of this evaluation sheet fully.

(e) You are requested not to express any biases or prejudices while responding to this sheet.

(f) You have been allotted a confidential code number on the front page.

With a view to helping me in my research work you will, I am sure, furnish me factual and honest responses without any sort of reservation.

Thanking you,

J.H.Shah.

A. Rating Scale

You write number 1 against the name of the professor who, according to you, is the best of all and in that way, you go on rating the professors in a descending order i.e., giving number 2,3..... and so on. You have to rate only those professors with whom you have come in close contact; you have NOT to rate those whom you do not know well or with whom you have had very little contact. Fist of all, you read the whole list; decide on the names of professors whom you would like to consider for rating and then only, start rating them in a descending order. YOU will rate the professors of your particular optional group only and not others.

	Name of the teacher	Rating order
(1)		
(2)		
(3)		
(4)		
.		
.		
.		
n		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B : GUESS WHO

Description of possible behaviour of professors is given below. You have to say to whom the description is quite applicable. It is possible that some description may be applicable to more than one professor or may not be applicable to any. You have to write the name(s) of the professor(s) to whom the description is fully applicable. If it is applicable to more than two, please write the names of as many of them without restricting yourself to only two.

(1) Comes to the class-room without adequate preparation and we do not get anything new.
(a) (b)

(2) It would have been more enjoyable if the lecture would have been continued for half an hour longer.
(a) (b)

(3) Mostly leaves the class-room before lecture-hour is over.
(a) (b)

(4) Has a good command over the subject.
(a) (b)

(5) We wait for the bell to go and have a sigh of relief when the lecture is over.
(a) (b)

(6) Orients us towards reference material which we should read.
(a) (b)

(7) Teaches in such a way that we get interested in his subject.
(a) (b)

(8) We will like to continue meeting him even after completing our M.Ed. study.
(a) (b)

(9) It doesn't matter much if we don't attend the lecture and rather read the books written in vernacular at home.
(a) (b)

(10) We scarcely know that the lecture-time is over.
(a) (b)

(11) Very often during the lecture, keeps on talking about himself.
(a) (b)

(12) We don't understand anything that he teaches in the class.
(a) (b)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(13) Accepts divergent-thinking of students and also encourages them.
(a) (b)

(14)It won't matter much if we don't attend his class-lectures if we could get his old lecture-notes on the subject.
(a) (b)

(15) He is not what he appears to be.
(He doesn't behave as he talks)
(a) (b)

(16)He talks more about other things than about the subject matter.
(a) (b)

(17) We very rarely burst into laughter during his lecture.
(a) (b)

(18) He does not merely go on lecturing in the classroom but he asks questions and encourages discussion.
(a) (b)

(19) We deeply feel that it could be better to prepare on our own than to attend his lecture.
(a) (b)

(20) If we have to miss his lecture for some personal or social reason, we feel sorry that we really missed something.
(a) (b)

(21) During his lectures, a very healthy rapport gets established between the teacher and the taught.
(a) (b)

(22) May god save us from such a professor !
(a) (b)

(23)Presentation in the classroom is so interrelated with supplementary research-literature that we have to visit library often.
(a) (b)

(24) At the end of the lecture, we do feel that we have learnt something new.
(a) (b)

C : Good-Bad Qualities

No person is totally good or totally bad. Every one possesses good as well as bad qualities. You write in good and bad

qualities of a professor in whose close contact you have come. Writing about only one side (good or bad) would perhaps be considered one-sided observation.

1. TEACHING STAFF :
(A) .....(write the name)

(i) as the Head of the Dept.(as an administrator)

+ ve - ve

(ii) As a teacher

+ ve - ve

Write below the names of the professors one after another and then, their + ve and - ve qualities :

(B).....(write the name)

+ ve - ve

(C).....(write the name)

+ ve - ve

and.....so on

II. NON-TEACHING STAFF:

(A) Headclerk.....(write the name)

+ ve - ve

(B) Typist.....(write the name)

+ ve - ve

(C) .....(Write the designation and the name of the person)

+ ve - ve

(D) Head-peon/peon.....(write the name)

+ ve - ve

D : DISSERTATION GUIDANCE

1: Your relationship with your guide for dissertation :

Put a tick-mark (✓) in appropriate place.

( ) Excellent ( ) Good ( ) Very fair

( ) Fair ( ) Poor

2: Below is a five-point scale. Put a tickmark (✓) in an appropriate column.(keep in view your experiences with your own guide while responding this scale)

Statements	always	frequently	some times	rarely	never
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. I get guidance as per schedule	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. I cannot keep appointments	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. The guide okays my work without going through it.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. He guides me with all due interest.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. The guide asks me to copy from earlier dissertations.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Such a guide is of no use.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. For want of necessary guidance, the work has to be completed seeking other's help.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. A congenial relationship between the guide and the student develops during the period of guidance.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Cover

(contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The time and place for meetings are fixed up as per convenience of the guide only.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. He postpones guidancework under one pre-text or the other.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. The guide him-self insists on keeping appoint-ments.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. The guide being involved in various other activities cannot impart proper guidance.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. It is felt that nothing is achieved by preparing a dessertation.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. I am happy with my guide.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. The whole work of dissertation is bogus and should, there-fore, be deleted from the M.Ed. course.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

3: On the basis of your experiences with your guide, give your opinions about your guide and also your suggestions regarding this dissertation work. (As for example, opinions may be like: I have always received good guidance from my guide, or it seems that the guide lags behind in shouldering the guidance-responsibility, etc., Suggestions may be like: It will be in the fitness of things if some arrangement is made to meet the guide once a week or so in the department itself; a log-book system for recording the meetings of the guide with the student should be introduced.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

E: THE BEST AND THE POOREST
(Professor & Guides)

1. Write below the names of two whom you consider the best ones :
   (a)
   (b)

2. Write below the names of two whom you consider the poorest ones :
   (a)
   (b)

   (It is QUITE ESSENTIAL to respond to both the above queries).

   Over and above the responses in the columns above, you are welcome to write in your additional observation with regard to other academic aspects like administration, teaching, dissertation guidance, library facilities, working hours, departmental facilities, etc.

The present investigator is thankful to Prof. R. S. Trivedi, the Ex-Vice-Chancellor of Bhavnagar University, Bhavnagar, and at present, Chairman of Higher Secondary Education Board, Gujarat State, for his invaluable suggestions for refining the tool.

END

DEPT. OF EDUCATION

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

MARCH

18 - 1986